

1 UNI TED STATES DI STRI CT COURT  
2 NORTHERN DI STRI CT OF ILLINOIS  
3 EASTERN DI VI SI ON

4 PFI ZER, INC., PRI ZER I RELAND  
5 PHARMACEUTICALS, WARNER-LAMBERT  
6 COMPANY, and WARNER-LAMBERT  
7 COMPANY, L. L. C.,

8 Plai nti ffs,

9 vs.

10 No. 08 C 7231

11 APOTEX, INC. and APOTEX CORP.,

12 Defendants.

13 APOTEX, INC. and APOTEX CORP.,

14 Counter-Plai nti ffs,

15 vs.

16 PFI ZER, INC., PRI ZER I RELAND  
17 PHARMACEUTICALS, WARNER-LAMBERT  
18 COMPANY, and WARNER-LAMBERT  
19 COMPANY, L. L. C.,

20 Counter-Defendants.

21 Chicago, Illinois  
22 March 24, 2009  
23 9:12 o'clock a.m.

24 TRANSCRI PT OF PROCEEDI NGS  
25 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT M. DOW, JR.

APPEARANCES:

For the Plai nti ffs:

WOOD, PHILLIPS  
BY: MR. JEFFREY M. DRAKE  
500 West Madison Street  
Suite 3800  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
(312) 876-1800

CONNOLLY, BOVE, LODGE & HUTZ  
BY: MS. MARY W. BOURKE  
MR. DANIEL C. MULVENY  
1007 North Orange Street  
Wilmington, Delaware 19899  
(302) 658-9141

1 APPEARANCES (Continued):  
2

3 For the Defendants: RAKOCZY, MOLINO, MAZZOCHI, SWIK, LLP  
4 BY: MR. WILLIAM A. RAKOCZY  
5 MR. ANDREW M. ALUL  
6 Six West Hubbard Street  
7 Suite 500  
8 Chicago, Illinois 60610  
9 (312) 222-6301

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 COLLEEN M. CONWAY, CSR, RMR, CRR  
24 Official Court Reporter  
25 219 South Dearborn Street, Room 2524-A  
Chi cago, Illinoi s 60604  
(312) 435-5594  
colleen\_conway@ind.uscourts.gov

1 (Proceedings in open court.)

2 THE CLERK: 08 C 7231, Pfizer versus Apotex.

3 THE COURT: Good morning, everybody.

4 MR. RAKOCZY: Good morning.

5 MR. DRAKE: Good morning, Your Honor.

6 MS. BOURKE: Good morning, Your Honor.

7 MR. DRAKE: Good morning, Your Honor.

8 Jeffrey Drake from the Wood, Phillips Law firm.

9 Today, I have with me Mary Bourke and Dan Mulveny from  
10 Connolly, Bove in Delaware. We're all on behalf of the  
11 Pfizer/Warren-Lambert plaintiffs.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Well, very good. Welcome to  
13 Chicago.

14 MS. BOURKE: Thank you.

15 MR. RAKOCZY: Good morning, Judge.

16 William Rakoczy on behalf of the Apotex defendants.

17 MR. ALUL: Andrew Alul, Your Honor, on behalf of the  
18 Apotex defendants as well.

19 THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

20 Well, I guess there's a lot of stuff you guys have  
21 dropped -- fairly complicated stuff, I might add -- on my desk,  
22 at least as an opening salvo, but, first, before we start on  
23 the status and the motions, I have to give you guys a report on  
24 the removal of a disqualifying interest on my part.

25 Here's the background. My wife has shares in an

1 investment partnership with her family, so her siblings and her  
2 father and her mother, and her father controls the trades with  
3 his broker.

4 At the time this case was filed, they had some small  
5 interest in Pfizer. And I looked at this, along with a couple  
6 other cases, and said to my wife, "This is getting absurd.  
7 You're creating massive problems for me by having all these  
8 individual stocks in very small amounts. Can you talk to your  
9 dad about this?" And they resolved, then, to divest themselves  
10 of all individual stocks and put their family partnership, or  
11 whatever it's called, into mutual funds, which takes care of  
12 any recusal problems for me, because I don't have to track  
13 mutual fund stocks that my wife and her family are in.

14 So, in any event, what I wanted -- there is an  
15 ethical opinion here, advisory opinion number 69, that  
16 basically says that if a judge to whom a matter has been  
17 assigned would be disqualifying, and it's clear, even though  
18 the original opinion said after substantial judicial time had  
19 been devoted to the matter, there's a later paragraph that  
20 clarifies and says it applies just as well to cases in which a  
21 judge has expended no judicial time, which is essentially where  
22 I was maybe a week ago, not quite so true today.

23 But -- so if the judge divests himself or if the  
24 judge's spouse, in this case, divests herself, that removes the  
25 basis for disqualification and I can continue to sit on the

1 case. So that is either in the process of being done or has  
2 been done. And I'll confirm that as soon as my in-laws return  
3 from vacation.

4 But, in any event, I needed to put that on the  
5 record, because the end of this advisory opinion says: Should  
6 the judge decide to continue to participate in the matter  
7 following disqualification of the disqualifying interest, the facts  
8 giving rise to the disqualification, the judge's disqualification of  
9 the disqualifying interest and the public interest, and  
10 continued participation of the judge should be known to the  
11 parties and of record in this case.

12 So I just wanted to put that on the record for you  
13 all to know, in case you wonder some day and you look at my  
14 disclosure reports why Pfizer's stock was on there at one time,  
15 okay?

16 MS. BOURKE: You probably have a better economic  
17 investment in the mutual funds, anyhow, given the market.

18 THE COURT: Well, we'll see how that goes. I think  
19 that they were well understanding that every stock they had to  
20 get out of they were taking a loss on, I think without  
21 exception, but that's where we are these days, so -- you know,  
22 maybe it will all come back.

23 But, anyway, I just wanted to put that on the record.  
24 If anybody had any comments, you know, feel free.

25 MR. RAKOCZY: Nothing from Apotex, Your Honor.

1 MS. BOURKE: No comment from Pfizer.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you very much.

3 Okay. Then we got -- I have three pretty major  
4 motions here. And let me ask you, before I ask you about those  
5 motions, what's the status in Delaware? Who's got the case in  
6 Delaware?

7 MS. BOURKE: It has been assigned to an Eastern  
8 District of Pennsylvania judge.

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MS. BOURKE: Yeah. There's a vacancy in the District  
11 Court, and so every fourth case gets assigned either to an  
12 Eastern District of Pennsylvania judge or a District of New  
13 Jersey judge.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MS. BOURKE: So it's been assigned to Judge Legrome  
16 Davis?

17 MR. MULVENY: Davis, correct.

18 THE COURT: Davis. Okay. And then I understand  
19 there's already a motion that's in the process of briefing  
20 there, right? And what's the briefing schedule on that motion?  
21 Do you guys know?

22 MR. RAKOCZY: Your Honor, there was a motion to  
23 dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and a motion to  
24 transfer filed. Responses came in, but an amended complaint  
25 has been filed. So right now, we're trying to determine what

1 we're going to do. But we'll likely reschedule those motions, and  
2 then responses and replies will have to come in.

3 THE COURT: Okay. So that case is kind of in the  
4 same posture as our case, sort of setting briefing schedules on  
5 initial motions.

6 Because it looks to me like there's a dispute  
7 whether -- whatever disputes between these parties there are,  
8 whether they ought to be heard in Delaware or in Illinois,  
9 that's like one issue. And another issue is while that's being  
10 sorted out, should one or both cases be stayed or should  
11 discovery be stayed, at least, until we figure out which judge  
12 and which magistrate are going to supervise the  
13 discovery. That seems to be kind of the posture we're in.

14 And these are fairly complicated motions. I mean,  
15 even the stay motion isn't that simple. The dismissal and the,  
16 you know, counterclaims and the subject matter jurisdiction and  
17 all that, that's too complicated for me to take on a quick read  
18 preparing for a status. So I would need briefing schedules on  
19 all the motions that are filed here. And I didn't know if you  
20 guys had had an opportunity to discuss what you think is  
21 reasonable in light of the other case and your caseloads and  
22 all of that.

23 MR. RAKOCZY: Your Honor, we have conferred on a  
24 briefing schedule.

25 My understanding was Pfizer wanted the stay motion

1 heard today. We'd prefer the opportunity to put a brief in on  
2 that subject, assuming that Your Honor is going to take  
3 briefing. We do have an agreed-upon schedule for all the  
4 motions here and in Delaware, actually.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's what I'd like to do.  
6 I mean, you know, the stay motion I think is easier than the  
7 other motions, but still is something that I wouldn't rule on  
8 without getting a response and a reply, if a reply is either  
9 warranted or wanted. I mean, replies are always optional to  
10 me, but most people take advantage of the opportunity to  
11 respond to what their adversary says. And if you are the  
12 moving party, you have the burden, you get the reply if you  
13 want it. So if you've got agreed briefing schedules, I'd be  
14 happy to take those.

15 MS. BOURKE: Yeah. Well, actually, I wasn't part of  
16 the negotiations, but it was agreed upon yesterday, this  
17 briefing schedule --

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MS. BOURKE: -- with another partner of mine. But we  
20 had -- as Mr. Rakoczy says, we had hoped the Court would hear  
21 the motion to stay today. It is not that complicated. And the  
22 briefing schedule was contingent upon the Court saying that it  
23 was not going to decide the stay motion. And if that's Your  
24 Honor's preference, then I guess we'll have to go with the  
25 contingent briefing schedule.

1                   THE COURT: Yes, I don't think I am prepared to rule  
2 on it orally, hearing you guys out today, because I am not as  
3 prepared as I ought to be based on just reading it. And so I'd  
4 rather do it with briefs.

5                   MS. BOURKE: Okay.

6                   THE COURT: So do you --

7                   MS. BOURKE: It's not that complicated.

8                   THE COURT: Well, you know --

9                   MR. RAKOCZY: We would need to disagree.

10                  THE COURT: You may disagree with that, right?

11                  MR. RAKOCZY: We disagree. I have the schedule here  
12 in the letter, if you want me to read it off, Your Honor.

13                  THE COURT: Yes. And it may be that I will decide  
14 the stay motion quickly and the other one will take more time,  
15 I mean, but, you know, I just -- unless it's obvious to me,  
16 without hearing the other side, I at least give them the chance  
17 to respond. And, you know, you've got 19 pages of paper here.  
18 They ought to at least be able to put their arguments on paper  
19 as well. So go ahead.

20                  MS. BOURKE: I understand, Your Honor.

21                  MR. RAKOCZY: I appreciate it, Judge.

22                  The parties have agreed on April 13th for responses  
23 for all of the motions.

24                  THE COURT: Okay.

25                  MR. RAKOCZY: And if replies are necessary, April

1 27th for all motions --

2 THE COURT: Well, you guys are one day off of what I  
3 had jotted down here as just my opening bid if you hadn't  
4 agreed, but that's perfect. Okay.

5 MR. RAKOCZY: Cai rvoyance, Your Honor.

6 MS. BOURKE: We also will be filing a motion to amend  
7 the complaint to bring in the reissued patent for --

8 THE COURT: I saw that one coming, too.

9 MS. BOURKE: Okay.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Do you know when you're going to  
11 do that?

12 MS. BOURKE: I would think this week.

13 THE COURT: This week? Okay.

14 MS. BOURKE: Yeah. I -- we -- as Mr. Rakoczy  
15 indicated, because they did not answer in the Delaware court,  
16 we just amended our complaint there as of right. And so it is  
17 already an issue and in play in Delaware.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. RAKOCZY: And, Your Honor, we have a schedule on  
20 that motion as well.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. RAKOCZY: We'd agreed to April 20th for the  
23 response and May 4th for the reply.

24 THE COURT: Okay. That sounds good. And then what I  
25 am going to ask -- and there is a protective order issue that

1 was noted in here, too. You guys are going to work that up and  
2 submit something that's agreed, I hope?

3 MR. RAKOCZY: We have a protective order draft.  
4 We're going to get back to them very shortly, Your Honor, with  
5 our comments. I don't believe we have too many.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Fantastic.

7 And then, you know, in terms of discovery, it doesn't  
8 make sense to me to proceed with discovery until we at least  
9 know what court is going to have this.

10 MS. BOURKE: That's our position.

11 THE COURT: Because I don't know what the procedures  
12 are in Delaware or the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and  
13 which ones are even applying, but I am a little weary of  
14 getting -- I mean, obviously, you guys are engaged in some  
15 discussions about your cases and know well, at least, what the  
16 issues are, what the patents are, but I am reluctant to issue  
17 discovery orders that some judge in Pennsylvania or Delaware  
18 would have to feel, at least partially, bound by, and they're  
19 probably feeling the same way. So I wasn't going to even  
20 launch into that today.

21 But I will not hold up the stay motion given that  
22 that's probably a precursor to all else here. So, as soon as  
23 that's briefed, we'll get on that as quickly as we can.

24 I know the week that the reply brief comes in, I have  
25 a trial, but as soon as we get through that, you know, we'll

1 jump on that motion, okay?

2 And then in terms of what's going on in Delaware, in  
3 the Delaware case -- we'll call it the Delaware case, it may be  
4 going on in Philadelphia or whatever -- but if you could always  
5 keep me up to date on developments that happen there. And I  
6 assume that Judge Davis probably will ask you the same. That  
7 way, we won't trip over each other, okay?

8 MR. RAKOCZY: Absolutely.

9 MS. BOURKE: That's fine, Your Honor.

10 MR. RAKOCZY: Will do.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

12 Okay. Anything else you guys have on the agenda for  
13 today?

14 MR. RAKOCZY: I think that's it, Judge.

15 MS. BOURKE: Not from Pfizer.

16 MR. RAKOCZY: It's more than enough.

17 THE COURT: Okay. You know, that's a fair bit of  
18 work to do, but I know you guys are big, experienced firms in  
19 this area, so you're well up to it, far better than a poor,  
20 little, old judge with his couple of law clerks.

21 So, anyway, thank you all very much.

22 MS. BOURKE: Thank you.

23 MR. MULVENY: Thank you, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: And nice to see you.

25 MR. ALUL: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: I'll see you again.

2 MR. RAKOCZY: Thank you, Judge.

3 THE COURT: Okay. And I will set a status whenever I  
4 get through this initial pile of stuff, unless the case is in  
5 Del aware, okay?

6 MS. BOURKE: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. RAKOCZY: Very good. Thank you.

8 THE COURT: Great. Thank you.

9 (Proceedings concluded.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E  
2  
3  
4

5 I, Colleen M. Conway, do hereby certify that the  
6 foregoing is a complete, true, and accurate transcript of the  
7 proceedings had in the above-entitled case before the  
8 HONORABLE ROBERT M. DOW, JR., one of the Judges of said Court,  
9 at Chicago, Illinois, on March 24, 2009.

10  
11  
12 /s/ Colleen M. Conway, CSR, RMR, CRR

03/27/09

13 Official Court Reporter  
14 United States District Court  
15 Northern District of Illinois  
16 Eastern Division  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Date